

From: lilaberman@hotmail.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, Apr 5, 2003 1:44 AM
Subject: Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Commissioner Michael C. Copps

Dear FCC Commissioner Michael C. Copps,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

We encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

Sincerely,

Lila and Irv Berman
1218 9th St
Santa Monica, California 90401

From: lilaberman@hotmail.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, Apr 5, 2003 1:45 AM
Subject: Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

We encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

Sincerely,

Lila and Irv Bernan
1218 9th St
Santa Monica, California 90401

From: lilaberman@hotmail.com
To: KathleenAbernathy
Date: Sat, Apr 5, 2003 1:45 AM
Subject: Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Dear FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

We encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

Sincerely,

Lila and Irv Berman
1218 9th St
Santa Monica, California 90401

From: Lois Johnston
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner
Adelstein
Date: Sat, Apr 5, 2003 1:48 AM
Subject: <No Subject>

Dear FCC commissioners, I heard that you are going to be deciding whether to relax regulations on media mergers soon. I hope you will not change the regulations. I believe that large media conglomerates are much less likely to meet the needs of real people than smaller ones. Sincerely, Lois Johnston 2709 W. Broadway Ave. Spokane, Wash. 99201

From: Lois Johnston
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner
Adelstein
Date: Sat, Apr 5, 2003 1:48 AM
Subject: <No Subject>

Dear FCC commissioners, I heard that you are going to be deciding whether to relax regulations on media mergers soon. I hope you will not change the regulations. I believe that large media conglomerates are much less likely to meet the needs of real people than smaller ones. Sincerely, Lois Johnston 2709 W. Broadway Ave. Spokane, Wash. 99201

From: Jeanine Payton-Gilvaheer
 To: J&M Costumers, Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
 Date: Sat, Apr 5, 2003 2:13 AM
 Subject: Media Consolidation

I am writing to each of you, the Federal Communications Commissioners on the subject of "media consolidation". I was watching NOW with Bill Moyers on my local PBS station, and I became aware that my nation's media are once again in grave danger. I was surprised to find the existing rules. Six of the rules currently up for evaluation were listed on the NOW website:

- Broadcast-Newspaper Cross-Ownership Prohibition (1975) Bans ownership of both a newspaper and a television station in the same market.

* National Television Ownership Rule (1941) A broadcaster cannot own television stations that reach more than 35% of the nation's homes.

• Dual Network Rule (1946) - No entity can own more than one major television network.

* Local Television Ownership Rule (1964) - A broadcaster can't own more than one of the top four stations in a single market.

* Local Radio Ownership Rule (1941) - Limits the number of radio stations any one entity can own in a single market.

- Television-Radio Cross-Ownership Rule (1970) - Limits the number of TV and radio stations a single entity can own in any given market.

There are currently exceptions to these rules, decisions made on a case-by-case basis.

I was surprised to find that these rules still existed...my everyday experience seems to be with the "current exceptions" to these rules which were "made on a case-by-case basis". I live in the Los Angeles area, and previously lived in College Station, Texas, and before that San Diego, California. I have been appalled at the media in Los Angeles. I have found such a lack of diversity, that I effectively have given up to the idea of listening to music on the radio, because there is no radio station on the air that plays the music I wish to hear. I expected that when I lived in the middle of nowhere Texas, but in Los Angeles? One of the largest cities in the nation? I am embarrassed and angry to admit that our "local" newspapers are no such thing, excepting the very, very small ones. I very much would like to support a locally run newspaper, reporting on local, state, national, and international issues and events that will affect the lives of myself and the people I love. But there isn't one. I'm not even going to go on to discuss the ownership issues on television. Suffice it to say that there are almost 300 million people in the United States (according to the U.S. Census Bureau's "POPClock")...and the vast majority of television networks are owned by six major companies. How's that for representation? We have six points of view, seven if you count PBS, between 300 million of us?

I expect you know by now my opinion on the idea of further consolidation within the media. As opposed to

relaxing the rules on media ownership concentration, I would like to see the rules restored, the exceptions revoked. In the report on NOW, they reported that Columbia University's "Project for Excellence in Journalism" found that (and I'm paraphrasing) a further concentration in media ownership would harm the quality of journalism and news reporting.

I was under the impression that by being a citizen, voter, and taxpayer in the United States of America, that I was a partial owner of the airwaves. That they were public property. That the media bought licences to use our airwaves. And if that is true, then I as a "stockholder" think that there should be a legitimate attempt to inform and then ask all the other "stockholders", our citizens, what they think about this idea of media concentration in light of the facts and the consequences of changing the rules concerning media ownership. I personally am completely against catering to the lobbies of these major corporations to allow them to use my national airwaves to allow them to offer less for a higher profit margin. I believe that a large portion of each channel should be used to inform the public, and provide forums for thoughtful, intelligent, and relevant discussions of issues facing us as individuals, as a society, and as part of the new global culture.

Thank You for your time, and I hope you are able to put my feedback to good use,
Jeanine Payton Gilvaheer
La Crescenta, CA 91214

jeanine@gilvaheer.com

Note: To everyone I carbon copied this to, I just would like to say that this is a very important issue, related to freedom of speech, public access, and what we are spoon fed by media. It will affect our access to information not only in what we are told, and how, but especially in what we are NOT told. Please weigh in on this important issue, and write to the FCC, as well as to your Congressional Representatives.

From: Jeanine Payton-Gilvahr
To: J&M Costumers, Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, Apr 5, 2003 2: 13 AM
Subject: Media Consolidation

I am writing to each of you, the Federal Communications Commisioners on the subject of "media consolidation". I was watching NOW with Bill Moyers on my local PBS station, and I became aware that my nation's media are once again in grave danger. I was surprised to find the existing **rules**. Six of the rules currently up for evaluation were listed on the NOW website:

- * Broadcast-Newspaper Cross-Ownership Prohibition **(1975)** Bans ownership of both a newspaper and a television station in the same market.

- † National Television Ownership Rule **(1941)** A broadcaster cannot own television stations that reach more than 35% of the nation's homes.

- Dual Network Rule **(1946)** - No entity can own more than one major television network.

- * Local Television Ownership Rule **(1964)** - A broadcaster can't own more than one of the top four stations in a single market.

- Local Radio Ownership Rule **(1941)** - Limits the number of radio stations any one entity can own in a single market.

- * Television-Radio Cross-Ownership Rule **(1970)** - Limits the number of TV and radio stations a single entity can own in any given market.

**There are currently exceptions to these rules, decisions made on a case-by-case basis.

I was surprised to find that these rules still existed...my everyday experience seems to be with the "current exceptions" to these rules which were "made on a case-by-case basis". I live in the Los Angeles area, and previously lived in College Station, Texas, and before that San Diego, California. I have been appalled at the media in Los Angeles. I have found such a lack of diversity, that I effectively have given up to the idea of listening to music on the radio, because there is no radio station on the air that plays the music I wish to hear. I expected that when I lived in the middle of nowhere Texas, but in Los Angeles? One of the largest cities in the nation? I am embarrassed and angry to admit that our "local" newspapers are no such thing, excepting the very, very small ones. I very much would like to support a locally run newspaper, reporting on local, state, national, and international issues and events that will affect the lives of myself and the people I love. But there isn't one. I'm not even going to go on to discuss the ownership issues on television. Suffice it to say that there are almost 300 million people in the United States (according to the U.S. Census Bureau's "POPClock")...and the vast majority of television networks are owned by six major companies. How's that for representation? **We** have six points of view, seven if you count PBS, between 300 million of **us**?

I expect you know by now my opinion on the idea of further consolidation within the media. **As** opposed to

relaxing the rules on media ownership concentration, I would like to see the rules restored, the exceptions revoked. In the report on **NOW**, they reported that Columbia University's "Project for Excellence in Journalism" found that (and I'm paraphrasing) a further concentration in media ownership would harm the quality of journalism and news reporting.

I was under the impression that by being a citizen, voter, and taxpayer in the United States of America, that I was a partial owner of the airwaves. That they were public property. That the media bought licences to use our airwaves. And if that is true, then I as a "stockholder" think that there should be a legitimate attempt to inform and then ask all the other "stockholders", our citizens, what they think about this idea of media concentration in light of the facts and the consequences of changing the rules concerning media ownership. I personally am completely against catering to the lobbies of these major corporations to allow them to use my national airwaves to allow them to offer less for a higher profit margin. I believe that a large portion of each channel should be used to inform the public, and provide forums for thoughtful, intelligent, and relevant discussions of issues facing us as individuals, as a society, and as part of the new global culture.

Thank You for your time, and I hope you are able to put my feedback to good use,
Jeanine Payton Gilvaheer
La Crescenta, CA 91214

jeanine@gilvaheer.com

Note: **To** everyone I carbon copied this to, I just would like to say that this is a very important issue, related to freedom of speech, public access, and what we are spoon fed by media. It will affect our access to information not only in what we are told, and how, but especially in what we are **NOT** told. Please weigh in on this important issue, and write to the FCC, as well as to your Congressional Representatives.

From: Jeanine Payton-Gilvaheer
 To: J&M Costumers, Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
 Date: Sat, Apr 5, 2003 2:13 AM
 Subject: Media Consolidation

I am writing to each of you, the Federal Communications Commisioners on the subject of "media consolidation". I was watching NOW with Bill Moyers on my local PBS station, and I became aware that my nation's media are once again in grave danger. I was surprised to find the existing rules. Six of the rules currently up for evaluation were listed on the NOW website:

* Broadcast-NewspaperCross-Ownership Prohibition (1975) Bans ownership of both a newspaper and a television station in the same market.

* National Television Ownership Rule (1941) A broadcaster cannot own television stations that reach more than 35% of the nation's homes.

* Dual Network Rule (1946) • No entity can own more than one major television network.

* Local Television Ownership Rule (1964) - A broadcaster can't own more than one of the top four stations in a single market.

• Local Radio Ownership Rule (1941) - Limits the number of radio stations any one entity can own in a single market.

* Television-Radio Cross-Ownership Rule (1970) - Limits the number of TV and radio stations a single entity can own in any given market.

"There are currently exceptions to these rules, decisions made on a case-by-case basis.

I was surprised to find that these rules still existed...my everyday experience seems to be with the "current exceptions" to these rules which were "made on a case-by-case basis". I live in the Los Angeles area, and previously lived in College Station, Texas, and before that San Diego, California. I have been apalled at the media in Los Angeles. I have found such a lack of diversity, that I effectively have given up to the idea of listening to music on the radio, because there is no radio station on the air that plays the music I wish to hear. I expected that when I lived in the middle of nowhere Texas, but in **Los** Angeles? One of the largest cities in the nation? I am embarrassed and angry to admit that our "local" newspapers are no such thing, excepting the very, very small ones. I very much would like to support a locally run newspaper, reporting on local, state, national, and international issues and events that will affect the lives of myself and the people I love. But there isn't one. I'm not even going to go on to discuss the ownership issues on television. Suffice it to say that there are almost 300 million people in the United States (according to the U.S. Census Bureau's "POPClock")...and the vast majority of television networks are owned by six major companies. How's that for representation? We have six points of view, seven if you count PBS, between 300 million of us?

I expect you know by now my opinion on the idea of further consolidation within the media. As opposed to

relaxing the rules on media ownership concentration, I would like to see the rules restored, the exceptions revoked. In the report on NOW, they reported that Columbia University's "Project for Excellence in Journalism" found that (and I'm paraphrasing) a further concentration in media ownership would harm the quality of journalism and news reporting.

I was under the impression that by being a citizen, voter, and taxpayer in the United States of America, that I was a partial owner of the airwaves. That they were public property. That the media bought licences to use our airwaves. And if that is true, then I as a "stockholder" think that there should be a legitimate attempt to inform and then ask all the other "stockholders", our citizens, what they think about this idea of media concentration in light of the facts and the consequences of changing the rules concerning media ownership. I personally am completely against catering to the lobbies of these major corporations to allow them to use my national airwaves to allow them to offer less for a higher profit margin. I believe that a large portion of each channel should be used to inform the public, and provide forums for thoughtful, intelligent, and relevant discussions of issues facing us as individuals, as a society, and as part of the new global culture.

Thank You for your time, and I hope you are able to put my feedback to good use,
Jeanine Payton Gilvaheer
La Crescenta, CA 91214

jeanine@gilvaheer.com

Note: To everyone I carbon copied this to, I just would like to say that this is a very important issue, related to freedom of speech, public access, and what we are spoon fed by media. It will affect our access to information not only in what we are told, and how, but especially in what we are NOT told. Please weigh in on this important issue, and write to the FCC, as well as to your Congressional Representatives.

From: aiiwave.owner@usa.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, Apr 5, 2003 2:40 AM
Subject: Media Ownership Regulation

Mr Powell:

I just saw you on TV

And so now I understand how the devout capitalist, neofascist takeover of the former democracy of America will be sealed. And in a timely fashion, no less. I suspect you think you should be proud of yourself. If so, you are as mistaken as you can be.

I guess my questions for you are:

1. Are you ignorant, stupid, brainwashed, blackmailed, paid-off, or(/and) just another run-of-the-mill neofascist who puts corporate efficiency and self interest above the best interests of the American people?
2. As a man of some color, do you believe that the only mistake made by Southern American slave-owners and klansmen was to have failed to perpetuate and make dominant their hateful way of life through the application of media control and superior military might and tactics?
3. Have you (and your pappy) confused an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution with blind, misguided loyalties to more-or-less deluded office-holders (and lobbyists) who would in any way weaken democracy or otherwise subvert the Constitution of the United States of America?

No need to reply; by your actions I shall know you (hopefully not as the man who drove the final spike through the heart of a gasping, dying democracy in america, but we shall see...).

How old am I? I still recall the phrase "fairness doctrine", from back when the notion of a small number of men controlling the US mass media was abhorrently unthinkable, same as it is now.

How informed am I? Well I found out about <http://observer.co.uk/iraq/story/0,12239,910657,00yhtml> visiting baghdad.com -- 'funny' how there was no mention of the story at cnn.com

When I can learn more about my own government's behavior by going to (and following a link from) baghdad.com than I can by going to cnn.com, there's something very fishy going on, and the stench is enormous!!!! (But I understand you're also working on the internet problem, to preclude such information from leaking out via the internet... I also fear that a devout capitalist lunatic such as yourself will now claim that my concerns are invalid because baghdad.com balances the reach of CNN. When government decision-makers place capitalistic desires over democratic imperatives, democracy is in Serious trouble.)

CLEARLY, the Bush regime wishes to behave badly and to keep secrets from its citizens, and the corporate-controlled mass media in the US is only too happy to oblige it.

But it was a pretty good democracy --with a free and open exchange on a glorious diversity of information and ideas and viewpoints --while it lasted, wasn't it?

"Anyone who has the power to make you believe absurdities has the power to make you commit

injustices."

- Voltaire, 1767

"I shall give a propagandist cause for starting the war. Never mind whether it is plausible or not. The victor will not be asked, later on, whether he told the truth or not. In starting and waging a war, it is not Right that matters but Victory. Have no pity. Adopt a brutal attitude... Right is on the side of the strongest."

- Adolf Hitler, 09/22/39 Speech to high officers

"Why of course the people don't want war ... But after all it is the leaders of the country who determine the policy, and it is *always* a simple matter to drag the people along, whether it is a democracy, or a fascist dictatorship, or a parliament, or a communist dictatorship ... Voice or no voice, the people can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is to tell them they are being attacked, and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger."

- Hermann Goering, Nazi leader, at the Nuremberg Trials

"We must make clear to the Germans that the wrong for which their fallen leaders are on trial is not that they lost the war, but that they started it. And we must not allow ourselves to be drawn into a trial of the causes of the war, for our position is that no grievances or policies will justify resort to aggressive war. It is utterly renounced and condemned as an instrument of policy."

- **US** Supreme Court Justice Robert L. Jackson,
US representative to the International Conference on
Military Trials in August 1945 and the chief prosecutor
at the Nuremberg war crimes trials

Democracy can fail; it's happened before: <http://www.commondreams.org/views03/0316-08.htm>

Every "joke" about the French is a stinging reminder about what a nation of cruel brutal warring might-makes-right Nazis/Klingons we have become: War is the ultimate expression of hatred. And anyone whose hate doesn't measure up to our own is a sissy coward, to be made fun of, because that's just the kind of people we are now.

That is why it is more important than ever that the airwaves must be kept as open and owned-by-the-people (the masses, not just shareholders, dammit!) as possible, if a once-vital democracy is to survive in the USA.

Are you [still] capable of standing up and doing the right thing, Michael? Or is it too late for that, too? No one should have to give you a Mercedes (and some Orwell books to read) in order to get you to **serve** the public interest; the public is paying you quite enough already; you needn't take anything more from them (to give to your rich powerful friends).

How do your of-the-privileged, for-the-rich decisions serve the public any better than did those of the Politburo, my Orwellian public servant?

Stop being a partisan political corporate servant. No matter how much they pay/promise you, you are not supposed to be working for them! Beware the dark side. You come across as some kind of sociopathic traitorous thief.

How much does a soul go for these days, Michael? And how many radio and television stations will it buy?

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: airwave.owner@usa.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, Apr 5, 2003 2:40 AM
Subject: Media Ownership Regulation

Mr Powell:

I just saw you on TV.

And so now I understand how the devout capitalist, neofascist takeover of the former democracy of America will be sealed. And in a timely fashion, no less. I suspect you think you should be proud of yourself. If so, you are as mistaken as you can be.

I guess my questions for you are:

1. Are you ignorant, stupid, brainwashed, blackmailed, paid-off, or(/and) just another run-of-the-mill neofascist who puts corporate efficiency and self interest above the best interests of the American people?
2. As a man of some color, do you believe that the only mistake made by Southern American slave-owners and klansmen was to have failed to perpetuate and make dominant their hateful way of life through the application of media control and superior military might and tactics?
3. Have you (and your pappy) confused an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution with blind, misguided loyalties to more-or-less deluded office-holders (and lobbyists) who would in any way weaken democracy or otherwise subvert the Constitution of the United States of America?

No need to reply; by your actions I shall know you (hopefully not as the man who drove the final spike through the heart of a gasping, dying democracy in america, but we shall see...).

How old am I? I still recall the phrase "fairness doctrine", from back when the notion of a small number of men controlling the US mass media was abhorrently unthinkable, same as it is now.

How informed am I? Well I found out about <http://observer.co.uk/iraq/story/0,12239,910657,00.html> by visiting baghdad.com -- 'funny' how there was no mention of the story at cnn.com

When I can learn more about my own government's behavior by going to (and following a link from) baghdad.com than I can by going to cnn.com, there's something very fishy going on, and the stench is enormous!!!! (But I understand you're also working on the internet problem, to preclude such information from leaking out via the internet... I also fear that a devout capitalist lunatic such as yourself will now claim that my concerns are invalid because baghdad.com balances the reach of CNN. When government decision-makers place capitalistic desires over democratic imperatives, democracy is in Serious trouble.)

CLEARLY, the Bush regime wishes to behave badly and to keep secrets from its citizens, and the corporate-controlled mass media in the US is only too happy to oblige it.

But it was a pretty good democracy --with a free and open exchange on a glorious diversity of information and ideas and viewpoints --while it lasted, wasn't it?

"Anyone who has the power to make you believe absurdities has the power to make you commit

injustices."

- Voltaire. 1767

"I shall give a propagandist cause for starting the war. Never mind whether it is plausible or not. The victor will not be asked, later on, whether he told the truth or not. In starting and waging a war, it is not Right that matters but Victory. Have no pity. Adopt a brutal attitude... Right is on the side of the strongest."

- Adolf Hitler, 09/22/39, Speech to high officers

"Why of course the people don't want war ... But after all it is the leaders of the country who determine the policy, and it is always a simple matter to drag the people along, whether it is a democracy, or a fascist dictatorship, or a parliament, or a communist dictatorship ... Voice or no voice, the people can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is to tell them they are being attacked, and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger."

- Hermann Goering, Nazi leader, at the Nuremberg Trials

"We must make clear to the Germans that the wrong for which their fallen leaders are on trial is not that they lost the war, but that they started it. And we must not allow ourselves to be drawn into a trial of the causes of the war, for our position is that no grievances or policies will justify resort to aggressive war. It is utterly renounced and condemned as an instrument of policy."

- US Supreme Court Justice Robert L. Jackson,
US representative to the International Conference on
Military Trials in August 1945 and the chief prosecutor
at the Nuremberg war crimes trials

Democracy can fail; it's happened before: <http://www.commondreams.org/views03/0316-08.htm>

Every "joke" about the French is a stinging reminder about what a nation of cruel brutal warring might-makes-right Nazis/Klingons we have become: War is the ultimate expression of hatred. And anyone whose hate doesn't measure up to our own is a sissy coward, to be made fun of, because that's just the kind of people we are now.

That is why it is more important than ever that the airwaves must be kept as open and owned-by-the-people (the masses, not just shareholders, dammit!) as possible, if a once-vital democracy is to survive in the USA.

Are you [still] capable of standing up and doing the right thing, Michael? Or is it too late for that, too? No one should have to give you a Mercedes (and some Orwell books to read) in order to get you to serve the public interest: the public is paying you quite enough already; you needn't take anything more from them (to give to your rich powerful friends).

How do your of-the-privileged, for-the-rich decisions serve the public any better than did those of the Politburo, my Orwellian public servant?

Stop being a partisan political corporate servant. No matter how much they pay/promise you, you are not supposed to be working for them! Beware the dark side. You come across as some kind of sociopathic traitorous thief.

How much does a soul go for these days, Michael? And how many radio and television stations will it buy?

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: aitwave.owner@usa.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, Apr 5, 2003 2:40 AM
Subject: Media Ownership Regulation

Mr Powell:

I just saw you on TV

And so now I understand how the devout capitalist, neofascist takeover of the former democracy of America will be sealed. And in a timely fashion, no less. I suspect you think you should be proud of yourself. If so, you are as mistaken as you can be.

I guess my questions for you are:

1. Are you ignorant, stupid, brainwashed, blackmailed, paid-off, or(/and) just another run-of-the-mill neofascist who puts corporate efficiency and self interest above the best interests of the American people?
2. As a man of some color, do you believe that the only mistake made by Southern American slave-owners and klansmen was to have failed to perpetuate and make dominant their hateful way of life through the application of media control and superior military might and tactics?
3. Have you (and your pappy) confused an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution with blind, misguided loyalties to more-or-less deluded office-holders (and lobbyists) who would in any way weaken democracy or otherwise subvert the Constitution of the United States of America?

No need to reply; by your actions I shall know you (hopefully not as the man who drove the final spike through the heart of a gasping, dying democracy in america, but we shall see...).

How old am I? I still recall the phrase "fairness doctrine", from back when the notion of a small number of men controlling the US mass media was abhorrently unthinkable, same as it is now.

How informed am I? Well I found out about <http://observer.co.uk/iraq/story/0.12239,910657,00.html> visiting baghdad.com - 'funny' how there was no mention of the story at cnn.com

When I can learn more about my own government's behavior by going to (and following a link from) baghdad.com than I can by going to cnn.com, there's something very fishy going on, and the stench is enormous!!!! (But I understand you're also working on the internet problem, to preclude such information from leaking out via the internet... I also fear that a devout capitalist lunatic such as yourself will now claim that my concerns are invalid because baghdad.com balances the reach of CNN. When government decision-makers place capitalistic desires over democratic imperatives, democracy is in Serious trouble.)

CLEARLY, the Busch regime wishes to behave badly and to keep secrets from its citizens, and the corporate-controlled mass media in the US is only too happy to oblige it.

But it was a pretty good democracy --with a free and open exchange on a glorious diversity of information and ideas and viewpoints --while it lasted, wasn't it?

"Anyone who has the power to make you believe absurdities has the power to make you commit

injustices."

- Voltaire. 1767

"I shall give a propagandist cause for starting the war. Never mind whether it is plausible or not. The victor will not be asked, later on, whether he told the truth or not. In starting and waging a war, it is not Right that matters but Victory. Have no pity. Adopt a brutal attitude... Right is on the side of the strongest."

- Adolf Hitler, 09/22/39 Speech to high officers

"Why of course the people don't want war ,.. But after all it is the leaders of the country who determine the policy, and it is always a simple matter to drag the people along, whether it is a democracy, or a fascist dictatorship, or a parliament, or a communist dictatorship ... Voice or no voice, the people can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is to tell them they are being attacked, and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger."

- Hermann Goering, Nazi leader, at the Nuremberg Trials

'We must make clear to the Germans that the wrong for which their fallen leaders are on trial is not that they lost the war, but that they started it. And we must not allow ourselves to be drawn into a trial of the causes of the war, for our position is that no grievances or policies will justify resort to aggressive war. It is utterly renounced and condemned as an instrument of policy."

- US Supreme Court Justice Robert L. Jackson,
US representative to the International Conference on
Military Trials in August 1945 and the chief prosecutor
at the Nuremberg war crimes trials

Democracy can fail; it's happened before: <http://www.commondreams.org/views03/0316-08.htm>

Every "joke" about the French is a stinging reminder about what a nation of cruel brutal warring might-makes-right Nazis/Klingons we have become: War is the ultimate expression of hatred. And anyone whose hate doesn't measure up to our own is a sissy coward, to be made fun of, because that's just the kind of people we are now.

That is why it is more important than ever that the airwaves must be kept as open and owned-by-the-people (the masses, not just shareholders, dammit!) as possible, if a once-vital democracy is to survive in the USA.

Are you [still] capable of standing up and doing the right thing, Michael? Or is it too late for that, too? No one should have to give you a Mercedes (and some Orwell books to read) in order to get you to serve the public interest; the public is paying you quite enough already; you needn't take anything more from them (to give to your rich powerful friends).

How do your of-the-privileged, for-the-rich decisions serve the public any better than did those of the Politburo, my Orwellian public servant?

Stop being a partisan political corporate servant. No matter how much they pay I promise you, you are not supposed to be working for them! Beware the dark side. You come across as some kind of sociopathic traitorous thief.

How much does a soul go for these days, Michael? And how many radio and television stations will it buy?

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps. KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Much2careful@aol.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, Apr 5, 2003 6:41 AM
Subject: Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Commissioner Michael C. Copps

Dear FCC Commissioner Michael C. Copps,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

Sincerely,

Charlotte Sherman
77 Fulton Street
New York, New York 10038